

REMARKS

Claim 33 was amended, as disclosed at page 1, lines 9-11 of the specification, to limit the scope of protection to situations where an optical signal is introduced into the optical fiber cable and then detected by the OTDR after a loss of connection in the optical fibre cable is detected. Pitchforth discloses the solution in which after detection of a loss of connection the network is switched to a test mode in which an OTDR function is used. This means that the OTDR is used only when there is a loss of signal, but there is nothing that discloses or suggests how to prevent the OTDR function from sending the OTDR signals along an unbroken section of the optical fiber cable. Pitchforth is not concerned with preventing damage to an optical component as a result of using OTDR signals. Pitchforth discloses a solution in which optical channel 112 effectively works as an OTDR, which can be remotely controlled.

According to Pitchforth's teaching, after a loss of signal indicating a cable cut is detected, the system is placed in the test mode, and no further detection of an optical signal (apart from detection of OTDR signals) is carried out. Clearly, Pitchforth fails to disclose introducing an optical signal into the optical cable after a break is detected and then detecting said optical signal by the OTDR.

In the present invention, when it is detected that the connection is lost and the introduced optical signal is detected by the OTDR, the OTDR signal is prevented from being transmitted. In Pitchforth's solution it is enough that the connection is lost to send the OTDR signals, and this may result in sending the OTDR signals along an unbroken fiber and damaging the optical equipment.

Therefore applicant believes that the amended independent claim is new. There is nothing in Pitchforth's disclosure that would suggest introducing the optical signals and detecting them when it is earlier detected that the connection is lost. A person skilled in the art would not arrive at the invention as defined in the amended independent claim based on Pitchforth because Pitchforth solves a completely different problem (i.e., remote control of the OTDR function). The problem of damage of an optical component by OTDR signals is not even acknowledged by Pitchforth. Therefore, in the applicant's opinion, the present invention is not obvious.

In view of these differences it is the applicant's opinion that the invention as defined in the amended independent claim 33 is new and inventive and therefore the claims dependent on claim 33 are also new and inventive.

Petition is hereby made for a two-month extension of the period to respond to the outstanding Official Action to January 7, 2008. **A check in the amount of \$340.00**, as the Petition fee, **which is the difference between the two month fee and the already paid one month fee of \$120.00**, is enclosed herewith. If there are any additional charges, or any overpayment, in connection with the filing of the amendment, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any such deficiency, or credit any such overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 11-1145.

Wherefore, a favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KIRSCHSTEIN, OTTINGER, ISRAEL & SCHIFFMILLER, P.C.

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

489 Fifth Avenue

New York, New York 10017-6105

Tel: (212) 697-3750

Fax: (212) 949-1690



Alan Israel

Reg. No. 27,564